

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,667	10/25/2001	Bruce A. Morgan	10287-044001 / MGH 1287.1	8278
26161	7590 04/09/2003			
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST		EXAMINER		
BOSTON, M.			MCKELVEY, TERRY ALAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1636	
			DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003	
				1)

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/037,667	MORGAN, BRUCE A.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Terry A. McKelvey	1636
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	corresp ndence address
A SH THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from Cause the application to become ARM FORM	rnely filed  ys will be considered timely. the mailing of a to this communication.
Status			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·	
2a)□	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This	is action is non-final.	
3)□ Dispositi	Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under a on of Claims	nce except for formal matters, p Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	rosecution as to the merits is 453 O.G. 213.
4)⊠	Claim(s) $\underline{1-34}$ is/are pending in the application		
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.	
5)[	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)□	Claim(s) is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)⊠ Applicatio	Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> are subject to restriction and/or e on <b>Papers</b>	election requirement.	
9) 🗌 7	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•	
	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accep		miner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11)[] T		is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disappro	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep		
12)∐ T	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	miner.	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) 🗌 🛚	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).
a)[	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
•	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.	
2	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Application	on No
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burese the attached detailed Office action for a list of the action for a list of t	ty documents have been receive	d in this National Stage
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic		
a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language proveknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	risional application has been rece	eived.
Attachment(	s)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
2)  Notice 3)  Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)
S. Patent and Trac TO-326 (Rev.	04.04)	on Summary	Part of Paper No. 11

Art Unit: 1636

## DETAILED ACTION

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, drawn to method of identifying a neural progenitor cell, classified in class 435, subclasses 6, 7.1, and 7.8.
- II. Claims 10-22, only as drawn to method of modulating cell differentiation comprising modulating expression of Daedalos, classified in class 435, subclass 375 and class 514, subclass 1.
- III. Claims 10-22, only as drawn to method of modulating cell differentiation comprising modulating levels of Daedalos, classified in class 435, subclass 375 and class 514, subclass 1.
- IV. Claims 10-22, only as drawn to method of modulating cell differentiation comprising modulating activity of Daedalos, classified in class 435, subclass 375 and class 514, subclass 1.
- V. Claims 23-26 and 29-34, drawn to method of determining if a subject is at risk for a neural cell related disorder comprising evaluating the level of expression

of Daedalus in a cell in a subject, classified in class 435, subclasses 6, 7.1, and 7.8.

- VI. Claims 23-26 and 29-34, drawn to method of determining if a subject is at risk for a neural cell related disorder comprising evaluating the level of protein of Daedalus in a cell in a subject, classified in class 435, subclasses 6, 7.1, and 7.8.
- VII. Claims 23-26 and 29-34, drawn to method of determining if a subject is at risk for a neural cell related disorder comprising evaluating the level of activity of Daedalus in a cell in a subject, classified in class 435, subclasses 6, 7.1, and 7.8.
- VIII.Claims 27-28, drawn to method of obtaining a population of neural cells comprising inhibiting the expression of Daedalos in a neural progenitor cell, classified in class 435, subclass 375.
- IX. Claims 27-28, drawn to method of obtaining a population of neural cells comprising inhibiting the levels of Daedalos in a neural progenitor cell, classified in class 435, subclass 375.
- X. Claims 27-28, drawn to method of obtaining a population of neural cells comprising inhibiting the

Art Unit: 1636

activity of Daedalos in a neural progenitor cell, classified in class 435, subclass 375.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Groups I-X are biologically and functionally different and distinct from each other and thus one does not render the other obvious. The methods of Groups I-X comprise steps which are not required for or present in the methods of the other groups: evaluating the level of expression of Daedalos in a sample of cells compared to a control to identify the sample as a neural progenitor cell (Group I), modulating the expression of Daedalos in a cell to modulate differentiation of the cell (Group II), modulating the levels of Daedalos in a cell to modulate differentiation of the cell (Group III), modulating the activity of Daedalos in a cell to modulate differentiation of the cell (Group IV), evaluating the level of expression of Daedalos in a cell from a subject at risk for a neural cell related disorder (Group V), evaluating the level of protein of Daedalos in a cell from a subject at risk for a neural cell related disorder (Group VI), evaluating the level of activity of Daedalos in a cell from a subject at risk for a neural cell related disorder (Group VII), allowing a neural progenitor cell which has inhibited expression of Daedalos to divide to produce

Art Unit: 1636

a population of neural cells (Group VIII), allowing a neural progenitor cell which has inhibited levels of Daedalos to divide to produce a population of neural cells (Group IX), allowing a neural progenitor cell which has inhibited activity of Daedalos to divide to produce a population of neural cells (Group X). The end result of the methods are different because of the different method steps. Thus, the operation, function and effects of these different methods are different and distinct from each other. Therefore, the inventions of these different, distinct groups are capable of supporting separate patents.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and the search required for each group is not required for the other groups because each group requires a different non-patent literature search due to each group comprising different products and/or method steps, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 1636

## Conclusion

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1636 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The official fax telephone numbers for the Group are (703) 308-4242 and (703) 305-3014.

NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning rejections or other major issues in this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terry A. McKelvey whose telephone number is (703) 305-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, except for Wednesdays, from about 7:30 AM to about 6:00 PM. A phone message left at this number will be responded to as soon as possible (i.e., shortly after the examiner returns to his office).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Remy Yucel can be reached on (703) 305-1998.

Art Unit: 1636

Page 7

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Terry A. McKelvey, Ph.D. Primary Examiner

Jeny a Mitchen

Art Unit 1636

April 7, 2003